



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,001	10/30/2003	Hidegori Usuda	9319S-000575	7423
27572            7590            12/28/2006 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER FIDLER, SHELBY LEE	
			ART UNIT 2861	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	12/28/2006	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/698,001	USUDA ET AL.
	Examiner Shelby Fidler	Art Unit 2861

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-28 and 31-36 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-28 and 31-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 23, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1).

#### Regarding claims 1 and 16:

Kimura et al. disclose a droplet discharging apparatus comprising:

means for discharging a discharge liquid (recording head) in the form of droplets (col. 9, lines 4-9) through an aperture (2) by mechanically deforming a piezoelectric element by a normal drive signal (col. 9, lines 4-9);

a drive integrated circuit (20) disposed adjacent to and in thermal contact with the piezoelectric element (9; Fig. 2);

a substrate (18) attached to and in thermal contact with the piezoelectric element and the drive integrated circuit (Fig. 2);

a diaphragm (10) disposed adjacent to and in thermal contact with the piezoelectric element (col. 3, lines 32-35 and Fig. 2); and

a temperature sensor (66) associated with the drive integrated circuit (Fig. 20a) for sensing a temperature of the drive integrated circuit (col. 8, lines 7-8);

wherein the sensed temperature of the drive integrated circuit approximates a temperature of the piezoelectric element (it is inherent to the invention of Kimura et al. that the sensed temperature of the drive integrated circuit approximates a temperature of the piezoelectric element since they are thermally coupled as shown in col. 9, lines 10-14 and Fig. 2);

wherein the approximated temperature of the piezoelectric element approximates a temperature of the diaphragm (it is inherent to the invention of Kimura et al. that the approximated temperature of the piezoelectric element approximates a temperature of the diaphragm since they are thermally coupled as shown in col. 9, lines 10-14 and Fig. 2);

wherein the approximated temperature of the diaphragm approximates a temperature of the discharge liquid (it is inherent to the invention of Kimura et al. that the approximated temperature of the diaphragm approximates a temperature of the discharge liquid since they are thermally coupled as shown in col. 9, lines 10-14 and Fig. 2); and

wherein the droplets are discharged from the aperture by a cooling drive signal (e.g. drive signal level corresponding to T2) based on the approximated temperature of the discharge liquid, which is different from the normal drive signal (col. 8, lines 47-57).

**Regarding claims 2 and 17:**

**Kimura et al. also disclose** that the droplets are discharged for a plurality of times by the cooling drive signal (inherent to col. 8, lines 47-50 since the temperature ranges are so large) so as to cool the discharge liquid to a specified temperature (col. 5, lines 32-37).

**Regarding claims 5 and 20:**

**Kimura et al. also disclose** that, if the temperature of the discharge liquid detected by a temperature detecting means exceeds a predetermined threshold temperature (e.g. 10 degrees

Celsius), then the droplets are discharged from the aperture by the cooling drive signal (col. 8, lines 52-54).

**Regarding claims 8 and 23:**

**Kimura et al.** also disclose that the discharge liquid is a printing ink (col. 9, lines 4-9).

**Regarding claim 33:**

**Kimura et al.** also disclose that the diaphragm separates the piezoelectric element from the discharge liquid (Fig. 2).

**Regarding claim 34:**

**Kimura et al.** also disclose that the piezoelectric element and the drive integrated circuit are attached to the substrate by an adhesive (21-23; Fig. 2).

**Regarding claim 35:**

**Kimura et al.** also disclose that the piezoelectric element and the drive integrated circuit are attached to the substrate and are spaced apart from one another (Fig. 2).

**Regarding claim 36:**

**Kimura et al.** also disclose approximating a temperature of the piezoelectric element includes approximating a temperature of a substrate in thermal contact with the piezoelectric element and the drive integrated circuit (col. 9, lines 10-14 and Fig. 2).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2861

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Kubo (US 6257688 B1).

**Regarding claims 3 and 18:**

Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that the cooling drive signal is set to a low frequency level that does not cause the piezoelectric element to heat the discharge liquid.

However, Kubo disclose a cooling drive signal that is set to a low frequency level that does not cause the piezoelectric element to heat the discharge liquid (col. 6, lines 36-40).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a cooling drive signal that is set at a low frequency into the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Kubo, is to avoid spray of ink when the temperature is high (col. 6, lines 50-54).

Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Tajika (US 5861895).

**Regarding claims 4 and 19:**

Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that the cooling drive signal has a waveform shape as to cause droplets of maximum weight.

However, Tajika discloses a cooling drive signal with a waveform shape as to cause droplets of maximum weight (col. 11, lines 33-35).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Tajika's waveform to provide droplets of maximum weight into the invention of

Art Unit: 2861

Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Tajika, is to minimize problems with temperature control (col. 11, lines 25-28).

Claims 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Nozawa (US 6499821 B1).

**Regarding claims 6 and 21:**

Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that, if the number of discharges within a predetermined time performed in response to the normal drive signal exceeds a predetermined threshold number of times, then the droplets are discharged from the aperture by the cooling drive signal.

However, Nozawa disclose that, if the number of discharges within a predetermined time performed in response to the normal drive signal exceeds a predetermined threshold number of times, then the droplets are discharged from the aperture by the cooling drive signal (col. 8, lines 1-12)

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Nozawa's threshold discharge count into the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Nozawa, is to avoid a "scorch" condition (col. 7, line 65 - col. 8, line 6).

Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Mikami (US 4633269).

**Regarding claim 7:**

Art Unit: 2861

**Kimura et al.** disclose all claimed limitations except that the cooling discharge by the cooling drive signal is carried out between normal discharges of droplets by the normal drive signal.

**However, Mikami** discloses a cooling discharge by a cooling drive signal that is carried out between normal discharges of droplets by the normal drive signal (col. 5, lines 40-46).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Mikami's alternating discharges into the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Mikami, is to control the temperature (col. 5, lines 36-38).

Claims 9, 11-13, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Usui et al. (US 6981761).

**Regarding claims 9 and 24:**

**Kimura et al.** disclose all claimed limitations except that the discharging liquid is an electrically conductive material for forming a wiring pattern.

**However, Usui et al.** disclose a discharging liquid that is an electrically conductive material for forming a wiring pattern (col. 27, lines 13-15).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to discharge an electrically conductive material from the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Usui et al., is to enable the manufacture of wiring (col. 27, lines 13-15).

**Regarding claims 11 and 26:**

**Kimura et al.** disclose all claimed limitations except that the discharge liquid is a resin for forming a color layer of a color filter.

**However, Usui et al. disclose a discharging liquid that is a resin for forming a color layer of a color filter (col. 25, lines 28-31).**

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to discharge a resin from the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Usui et al., is to enable the manufacture of a color filter (col. 25, lines 28-31).

**Regarding claims 12, 13, 27, and 28:**

**Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that the discharge liquid is a fluorescent organic compound exhibiting electroluminescence.**

**However, Usui et al. disclose a discharge liquid that is a fluorescent organic compound exhibiting electroluminescence (col. 27, lines 27-30).**

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to discharge an electro-optic material from the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Usui et al., is to enable the manufacture of EL display devices (col. 27, lines 24-27).

Claims 10 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Shinoura (US 6714173 B2).

**Regarding claims 10 and 25:**

**Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that the discharge liquid is a transparent resin for forming a microlens.**

**However, Shinoura discloses a discharge liquid that is a transparent resin for forming a microlens (col. 9, lines 40-43).**

Art Unit: 2861

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to discharge a transparent resin from the invention of Kimura et al. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Shinoura, is to produce lenses (col. 9, lines 22-25).

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1) in view of Ishizaki (US 6454377 B1).

**Regarding claims 31 and 32:**

Kimura et al. disclose all claimed limitations except that the temperature of the discharge liquid is determined by detecting a temperature of the piezoelectric element.

However, Ishizaki discloses that the temperature of the discharge liquid is determined by detecting a temperature of the piezoelectric element (col. 16, lines 32-40).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the position of Kimura et al.'s temperature sensor to measure the temperature of the discharge liquid instead of the ambient temperature. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Ishizaki, is so that ink droplets may be ejected in a stable manner irrespective of the changes in ink due to temperature (col. 16, lines 40-43).

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see the rejection above to Kimura et al. (US 6386672 B1), which discloses a droplet discharging apparatus including a drive integrated circuit in thermal contact with a piezoelectric element via a substrate, a piezoelectric element disposed adjacent to a diaphragm, and a substrate in thermal contact with both a drive

integrated circuit and a piezoelectric element, whereby the diaphragm is disposed between the piezoelectric element and a discharging liquid.

*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2861

***Communication with the USPTO***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelby Fidler whose telephone number is (571) 272-8455. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*Shelby L. Fidler 12/15/08*

Shelby Fidler  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2861



STEPHEN MEIER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER